

Debra Grassgreen and Karl Knight
c/o Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl & Jones LLP
One Sansome Street, Suite 3430
San Francisco, CA 94104
E-mail: dgrassgreen@pszjlaw.com

Eric and Julie Carlson
Calistoga, CA

Individual Fire Victims

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

In re:

PG&E CORPORATION,

-and-

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,

Debtors.

- ☐ Affects PG&E Corporation
☐ Affects Pacific Gas and Electric
Company
☒ Affects both Debtors

** All papers shall be filed in the lead case,
No. 19-30088 (DM)*

Case No. 19-30088

Chapter 11

Jointly Administered

**DECLARATION OF DEBRA
GRASSGREEN IN SUPPORT OF
RESPONSE OF INDIVIDUAL FIRE
VICTIMS TO MOTION OF WILLIAM B.
ABRAMS PURSUANT TO
BANKRUPTCY RULE 5004 AND 28
U.S.C. SECTION 144 AND 455 AND
BANKR. LOCAL RULE 3-14 FOR ENTRY
OF AN ORDER AUTHORIZING THE
RECUSAL OF THE HONORABLE
DENNIS MONTALI**

[Relates to Docket Number 13260]

I, Debra Grassgreen, declare as follows:

1. I am a restructuring attorney based in San Francisco. I have occasionally appeared before Judge Montali in matters unrelated to these bankruptcy cases. My records reflect that I have been involved in four cases (other than PG&E's current bankruptcy case) pending before Judge Montali (and one case where Judge Montali handled an isolated issue for Judge Blumenstiel) over the past ten years. During the past two decades, I have periodically participated on education panels, committees, and programs for professional organizations with Judge Montali.

1 2. My family and I were victims of the Atlas fire in 2017. We timely submitted claims
2 in these bankruptcy cases and I have actively monitored the filings that impacted our family's
3 claims. I reviewed the objection to confirmation of the PGE plan filed by certain business claimants
4 based on, among other things, the lack of judicial review in the CRP. ECF No. 7072. We had
5 similar concerns to those raised by the business claimants regarding objectionable provisions of the
6 CRP. Inasmuch as the business claimants fully briefed the issues related to the lack of judicial
7 review, we had not initially planned to file an objection on that basis; we thought it was unnecessary
8 because the issues were already before the Court.

9 3. I listened to the hearing on May 15, 2022, on the business claimants' objections to the
10 claims resolution procedures ("May 15th Hearing").

11 4. After hearing the Court's statements on the record at the May 15th Hearing, I
12 concluded there was a chance that the Court would determine any parties not specifically objecting
13 to the lack of judicial review would be deemed to have consented to that provision in the CRP. I
14 discussed this with my husband and with our close friend, Eric Carlson. Eric had previously
15 objected to the approval of the disclosure statement and had told me that he was also objecting to
16 confirmation of the plan. After that conversation, although we felt the issues regarding lack of
17 judicial review in the CRP had been fully briefed by the business claimants and they had advocated
18 for judicial review for all fire victims, in light of the Court comments at the May 15th Hearing our
19 family filed a statement preserving our objection to judicial review. We filed that statement after the
20 conclusion of the May 15th Hearing.

21 5. Mr. Abrams states in his Motion that "[i]t is certainly reasonable to question how this
22 one party that has a relationship with Judge Montali was able to ascertain this and file this notice of
23 non-consent on the same day as the hearing." As explained above, I listened to the hearing carefully
24 and the Court stated on the record that he felt he could rule this way. Mr. Abrams inference that we
25 were provided some advance notice of this ruling as a result of some "relationship" with the Court is
26 completely false.

27 6. Following the Court's May 26th ruling, I reached out to the Debtors and the Tort
28 Claimants Committee to request copies of the revised plan documents that would implement the

1 Court's ruling and provide the right of judicial review in the CRP. Upon review of the initial draft of
2 the CRP, I contacted counsel for the Trustee and the counsel for the TCC and expressed issues with
3 the newly added provisions regarding judicial review. We provided comments to the draft CRP,
4 some of which were accepted. However, we could not resolve all of our objections to the revised
5 CRP. Accordingly, the matter was brought before the Court for resolution.

6
7 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

8 Executed this 30th day of November, 2022.

9 

10 By: /s/ Debra Grassgreen
11 Debra Grassgreen
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28